

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, and 15-17 are pending in the present application, Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, and 17 having been amended, and Claims 6 and 14 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, and 17 is found, for example, in FIG. 3B. Claim 13 is amended to correct a grammatical informality.

Applicants, respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,099,574, herein Fukuda) in view of Hirotaka (Japanese Patent Application No. 08-282456, herein Hirotaka).

Applicants thank the Examiners for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants representative on May 17, 2006. During the interview, differences between the present invention and the applied art, and the rejections noted in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. The Examiners acknowledged that amending the claims to change “virtual image” to “mirror image” would overcome the outstanding grounds of rejection. However, no agreement as to allowability was reached pending the Examiner’s further review when a response is filed. Arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as unpatentable over the combination of Fukuda and Hirotaka, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to Claim 1 overcomes this ground of rejection. Claim 1 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, “displaying mirror images, as well as real images included in the calculation area.”

During the above-note interview, the Examiner explained that he was interpreting paragraph [0023] of Hirotaka as disclosing a virtual image and a real image. Particularly, the

Examiner explained that he interpreted Hirotaka's disclosure of "the flux at the boundary is calculated as this Gauss function exceeds the simulation boundary and extends outside the boundary" as a simulation that describes an ion passing through the calculation area (i.e., a real image) and then displaying a virtual image (i.e., which the Examiner interprets as any image outside of the boundary) when the ion crosses the boundary.

However, Hirotaka does not disclose displaying mirror images, as well as real included in the calculation area. The ion in Hirotaka that crosses the boundary is not a mirror image of a real image inside the calculation area.

Furthermore, Fukuda does not cure the above-noted deficiency in Hirotaka. Fukuda does not disclose or suggest the claimed "displaying the mirror images, as well as real images included in the calculation area."

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and Claims 3-5, 7, and 8 dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Hirotaka and Fukuda, taken alone or in proper combination.

Amended Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, "an image display module configured to display mirror images, as well as real images included in the calculation area." Hirotaka and Fukuda, as characterized above, fail to disclose or suggest at least this element of Claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 (and Claims 11-13, 15, and 16 dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Hirotaka and Fukuda, taken alone or in proper combination.

Amended Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, "displaying mirror images, as well as real images included in the calculation area." Hirotaka and Fukuda, as characterized above, fail to disclose or suggest at least this element of Claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Hirotaka and Fukuda, taken alone or in proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796

I:\ATTY\JW\217804US\217804US_AM DUE 5-28-06.DOC

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423